REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending. Claims 1 and 7 are independent, and have been amended herein.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Office Action, claims 1, 4-7 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,787,402 (Potter).

Claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Potter at least because claim 1 recites:

> A method for pricing a trade comprising:
>
> providing a user input for entering trade data;
>
> providing a structure for receiving said trade data;
>
> **providing a user input for optionally manually entering pricing data;**
>
> if pricing data has been manually entered by the user, adding the pricing data to the structure;
>
> if the user has not manually entered pricing data, transmitting said structure to a pricing system;
>
> if the user has not manually entered pricing data, receiving said structure from said pricing system; and
>
> **displaying said structure with said trade data including pricing information.**

(emphasis added).

Thus, by way of the method of amended claim 1, a user has the option of "manually entering pricing data" after, for example, speaking with his or her broker on the telephone, or if the user has not manually entered pricing data, "transmitting said structure to a pricing system."

Support for this amendment can be found in the present application as published (US 2005/0027658 A1) at least at figure 2 (See box 204: "Price deals over the phone with JPMorgan or email unpriced file for pricing and load priced file on return"), figure 3 and paragraphs [0030] through [0032]. By providing for this optional interface with a broker or other financial professional, the claimed invention provides for an automated foreign exchange trading platform that nonetheless also allows for the benefits of "personal interaction with a sales or marketing person at a financial institution." (Present application at paragraph [0004]).

On the other hand, while Potter does describe a system that accepts a user input for entering trade data, as well as transmission of the trade data to a pricing system, Potter does not teach or describe the additional feature of also "providing a user input for optionally manually entering pricing data," as recited by amended claim 1 of the present application.

Thus, at least because Potter does not teach or suggest "providing a user input for optionally manually entering pricing data," in combination with the other recited features of claim 1, Potter does not anticipate claim 1.

Independent amended claim 7 comprises similar features as claim 1 and is therefore not anticipated by Potter for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Each of claims 4-6 and 12-15 ultimately depend from one of claims 1 or 7 and are therefore not anticipated by Potter for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 7.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 is in condition for allowance and request that the examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Independent claim 7 comprises similar features as claim 1 and is therefore not anticipated by Potter for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 4-6 and 12-15 ultimately depend from claim 1 or 7 and are therefore not anticipated by Potter for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 7.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 4-7 and 12-15 are in condition for allowance and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to those claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, claims 2,3 and 8-11are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Potter in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0156719 (Finebaum).

Applicants submit that, for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on a combination or references, the prior art references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. (MPEP 706.02(j)). Each of claims 2, 3 and 8-11 depends either directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 7 and is therefore not anticipated by or obvious in view of Potter for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 7. Finebaum is describes a bond trading system, does not cure the deficiencies of Potter. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2,3 and 8-11 are in condition for allowance and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to those claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the currently-pending claims are in condition for allowance and favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 26 March 2008   / James Dobrow /

By: James Dobrow
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,666

Mail all correspondence to:

DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR
LOWENSTEIN SANDLER PC
65 Livingston Avenue
Roseland, NJ 07068